

1 **Rollin A. Ransom (SBN 196126)**
 2 **Courtney J. Chai (SBN 242266)**
 3 **rransom@sidley.com**
 4 **cchai@sidley.com**
 5 **SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP**
 6 **555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000**
 7 **Los Angeles, California 90013**
 8 **Telephone: (213) 896-6000**
 9 **Facsimile: (213) 896-6600**

10 **Attorney for Defendant HBM Inc.**

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14 LANSMONT CORPORATION,
 15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 SPX CORPORATION, a Delaware
 18 corporation; SPECTRIS PLC, a private
 19 limited company; BRUEL & KJAER, a
 20 corporation, and HBM, Inc. a
 21 corporation

22 Defendants.

Case No. CV 10-5860 JF

**STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME
 TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND
 [PROPOSED] ORDER**

Complaint served: January 24, 2011
 Current response date: March 14, 2011
 New response date: April 13, 2011

1 This Stipulation is made and entered into pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-1(b)
2 and 6-2 by and between plaintiff Lansmont Corporation (“Lansmont”) and defendant
3 HBM, Inc. (“HBM”), by and through their respective counsel, with reference to the
4 following:

5 1. WHEREAS, on December 23, 2010, Lansmont filed its Complaint (“the
6 Complaint”) in the above-referenced matter;

7 2. WHEREAS, on January 24, 2011, Lansmont served the Complaint on
8 HBM;

9 3. WHEREAS, under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,
10 HBM’s answer or other response was originally due on or before February 14, 2011;

11 4. WHEREAS, Lansmont and HBM previously agreed to extend HBM’s
12 time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint by twenty eight (28) days, to
13 March 14, 2011;

14 5. WHEREAS, Lansmont and HBM have agreed mediate their dispute in
15 early April 2011, and are currently in the process of retaining a mediator for such
16 mediation;

17 6. WHEREAS, Lansmont and the defendants who have been served to date
18 have agreed to defer the initial Case Management Conference to April 29, 2011;

19 8. WHEREAS, this extension is not sought for the purpose of improper
20 delay, and will not prejudice plaintiff; instead, the purpose of this extension is to
21 permit Lansmont and HBM time to attempt to resolve their dispute through mediation,
22 without incurring unnecessary legal fees in the interim.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

1 NOW, THEREFORE, subject to the approval of this Court, Lansmont and
2 HBM hereby stipulate that HBM shall have an extension of thirty (30) days, to and
3 including April 13, 2011, to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint.

4 Dated: March 9, 2011 PEARSON, SIMON WARSHAW & PENNY, LLP

5
6 By: /s/ William J. Newsom
7 William J. Newsom, Esq.
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff Lansmont Corporation

9
10 Dated: March 9, 2011 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

11 By: /s/ Courtney J. Chai
12 Rollin A. Ransom
13 Courtney J. Chai
14 Attorneys for Defendant HBM, Inc.

15 I, Courtney J. Chai, am the ECF user whose identification and password are
16 being used to file the instant document. Pursuant to General Order 45, I attest that
17 William J. Newsom provided his authority and concurrence to file the instant
18 document and place his electronic signature on the document set forth above.

19 By: /s/ Courtney J. Chai
20 Courtney J. Chai
21 Attorney for Defendant HBM, Inc.

22 ORDER

23 HBM's time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint is hereby
24 extended by thirty (30) days to and including April 13, 2011.

25 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 DATED: 3/21/11

27 
28 Hon. Jeremy Fogel